

# **Exhibit A**

Order, *Hunt v. Zuffa*, 2:17-cv-00085 (D. Nev. Aug. 20, 2018)

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 \* \* \*

6 MARK HUNT,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 ZUFFA, LLC, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00085-JAD-CWH

11  
12 **ORDER**

13 Presently before the court is defendants Zuffa, LLC and Mark White's renewed motion  
14 for leave to file exhibits under seal and to redact a portion of their reply in support thereof (ECF  
15 No. 135), filed on August 1, 2018. Plaintiff did not file a response.

16 Defendants previously filed a motion to seal various exhibits in support of their pending  
17 motion to dismiss, arguing that the exhibits were subject to confidentiality agreements. (ECF  
18 Nos. 114, 129). The court denied their request without prejudice and ordered the clerk of court to  
19 maintain the exhibits under seal for 14 days. (ECF No. 133.) Defendants now move to renew  
20 their motions to seal exhibits in support of their motion to dismiss and to redact a portion of their  
21 reply. (ECF No. 135.) Defendants argue that compelling reasons support their request to seal the  
22 exhibits and their reply.

23 Generally, the public has a right to inspect and copy judicial records. *Kamakana v. City &*  
24 *Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). Such records are presumptively publicly  
25 accessible. *Id.* Consequently, a party seeking to seal a judicial record "bears the burden of  
26 overcoming this strong presumption." *Id.* In the case of dispositive motions, the party seeking to  
27 seal the record "must articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that  
28 outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the  
public interest in understanding the judicial process." *Id.* at 1178-79 (alteration and internal

1 quotation marks and citations omitted). Among the compelling reasons which may justify sealing  
2 a record are “when such court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes, such as  
3 the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or  
4 release trade secrets.” *Id.* at 1179 (quotation omitted).

5 Here, defendants move to seal exhibits that contain agreements between defendant Zuffa  
6 and plaintiff, and to redact a portion of their reply that quotes an agreement. Defendants claim  
7 that the agreements contain proprietary information, and that public disclosure would harm  
8 Zuffa’s contractual relationships with other fighters and its competitive standing with MMA  
9 promoters. The court finds that defendants have identified compelling reasons that warrant  
10 sealing the exhibits attached to their motion to dismiss, and redacting a portion of their reply in  
11 support thereof. Therefore, the court will grant defendants renewed motion to seal.

12 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED defendants Zuffa, LLC and Mark White’s renewed  
13 motion for leave to file exhibits under seal and to redact a portion of their reply in support thereof  
14 (ECF No. 135) is GRANTED.

15  
16 DATED: August 20, 2018

17  
18   
19 C.W. HOFFMAN, JR.  
20 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28